DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 140 SP 031 116

AUTHOR Fischetti, John; And Others
TITLE The Summer Experiences of Two Model School/University Teacher Education Partnerships.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Anaheim, CA, March 2-5, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; Higher Education; *Program Development; Secondary Education; Student Recruitment; *Student Teaching; *Summer Programs; Team Teaching

ABSTRACT

Secondary summer schools for student remediation and enrichment linked with university teacher education programs provide opportunities for rethinking and restructuring student teaching and staff development programs. Based on the experiences of two model programs, this paper centers on the collaborative planning and initiation of intensive teacher education prepracticum courses, clinical site student teaching environments, and follow-up courses held during a second summer following an academic year of intensive teaching. The joint recruitment and selection process, critical to both programs' success, is highlighted. Following summaries of both programs, discussion focuses on: (1) the opportunities and limitations of the summer portion of both programs; (2) roles that university faculty, teachers, and administrators played in summer teaching and coursework; (3) the importance of the cohort and teamed student teaching; (4) the joint planning processes required to initiate and maintain the programs; (5) the use of a second summer for students; and (6) implications for teacher educators of the summer school linkages. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309140

The Summer Experiences of Two Model School/University Teacher Education Partnerships

John Fischetti
School of Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292

Allan Dittmer
School of Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292

V. Daniel Ochs
School of Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292

Richard Clark
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

A paper presented to the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Session Organizer--John Fischetti
(502) 588-6591

1989 Annual Conference
Anaheim, California
March 2-5, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Fischetti

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP031116

The Summer Experiences of Two Model School/University Teacher Education Partnerships

John Fischetti
Allan Dittmer
V. Daniel Ochs
Richard Clark

The summer is an excellent time to plan, develop, and initiate collaborative school/university teacher education partnerships. Secondary summer schools for student remediation and enrichment linked with university teacher education programs provide outstanding opportunities for rethinking and restructuring student teaching and staff development programs.

Based on the experiences of two model programs at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst and the University of Louisville, this paper will center on the collaborative planning and initiation of intensive teacher education prepracticum courses, clinical site student teaching environments, and follow-up courses held during a second summer following academic year intensive teaching. Also highlighted will be joint recruitment and selection process that are critical to both programs' success.

The paper draws upon our work with the Math English Science Technology Education Project (MESTEP) of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst and the Experimental Post-Baccalaureate Secondary Teacher Preparation Program of the School of Education at the University of Louisville. Following summaries of both projects, the authors will discuss: the

opportunities and limitations of the summer portion of both programs; roles that university faculty, teachers, and administrators play in summer teaching and coursework; the importance of the cohort and teamed student teaching; joint planning processes required to initiate and maintain the programs; the use of a second summer for students; and implications for teacher educators of the summer school linkages.

MESTEP

The Math English Science Technology Education Project (MESTEP) is a fifteen month collaborative M.Ed./certification program of the University of Massachusetts, a network of public schools, and 15 Massachusetts corporations. Begun in 1982, MESTEP was developed as a response to the shortage of highly qualified recent college graduates in math and science who choose to start their careers by teaching.

Currently recruiting its seventh class to begin their study in June 1989, MESTEP's program design gives students the opportunity to center their Master's degree program around two paid internships. During the first summer, MESTEP candidates spend one month in Amherst working closely together in courses designed to explore and practice the work of a beginning teacher. Following that month, the program moves to Acton High School where the summer school has been modified to give MESTEP students a chance to student teach in the mornings and intensively plan and develop strategies with experienced mentor teachers during the afternoon. One half of the group spends the Fall semester in

a full-time paid teaching internship, assuming the responsibilities of a regular teacher. The other half of the group spends the Fall working full-time in an educational setting in a Massachusetts corporation. In the Spring semester, the two groups switch roles. The industry internships primarily involve students in training components of the companies' educational services divisions. This year, for example, MESTEP students are teaching Lotus 1-2-3 to new employees at Digital Equipment Corporation, listening skills to managers at New England Telephone, working in the human resources division of Millipore Filters, and editing textbooks at Houghton-Mifflin. A second summer of full-time course work completes the requirements for the M.Ed. and Massachusetts teacher certification and serves as a bridge between the program and full-time teaching.

MESTEP asks graduates to commit to teaching for at least three years following completion of the program. During that time, corporate partners attempt to find summer employment at the corporations in which the students completed their internships. Thus far about 40% of the graduates have chosen this summer employment option.

MESTEP students have an overall undergraduate grade point average of 3.4, and rank on average in the 80th percentile on the Graduate Record Exam. Over the past three years MESTEP, with the assistance of the school and industry partners, has met a program goal for minority participation of at least 25%.

Post-Baccalaureate Experimental Certification Program

Older, non-traditional students with backgrounds in business, law, science, and other fields are increasingly inquiring about changing careers and entering high school teaching. Most have always thought about being a teacher but because of financial constraints, family and peer pressures, or a variety of other reasons, make other career choices. For many, the special opportunity to work with young people, to serve in a stimulating and caring profession lures them from jobs that may include high status and/or pay, but lack the personal fulfillment they are seeking.

These adults, many of whom have not been students for many years, have family, financial, and other obligations which teacher preparation programs often cannot or do not address. Regular certification programs typically maintain rigid course/field experience sequences, and can take as long as 2 years or more to complete. For these reasons, many talented mid-career individuals who inquire about teaching are quickly discouraged by existing programs and fail to enroll. Recent teacher education reform literature, led by the Holmes Group (1986) and Carnegie Commission Task Force (1986), call for creative post-baccalaureate options to facilitate the entry of talented candidates with strong liberal arts backgrounds to teaching. These options serve three purposes: 1) to enhance the content area and core backgrounds of new teachers, 2) to increase the supply of second career and mid-career candidates to help

offset an emerging demand, and 3) to link more effectively with experienced teachers.

In Kentucky, few alternative options exist for the kinds of talented individuals who in mid-career are considering teaching. And few programs exist that make use of strong school relationships to support such options. One such program, the Post-Baccalaureate Experimental Secondary Certification Program, was developed by the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Louisville. The program is enthusiastically endorsed by the Kentucky State Department of Education. The Experimental Program began in the summer of 1988 with support from a grant awarded by the Kentucky Council on Higher Education, which was used to establish the Center for the Collaborative Advancement of the teaching profession at the University of Louisville. The Secondary Education Department of the School of Education at the University of Louisville is able to draw upon an expanding network of school personnel who are enthusiastic about developing a link between teacher education and the continuing (staff) development of experienced educators.

The Experimental Program attracted 52 extremely talented individuals, including 8 minority students, to formally apply for admission during this pilot year. It is a 14 month alternative certification/MAT option designed to recruit, select, and prepare diverse and talented mid-career professionals who are interested in becoming classroom teachers. Fourteen candidates, including 2 minorities were admitted to the program in 1988. Through a

flexible curriculum that is predominantly field-based in teamed situations, the program seeks to provide an intensive combination of subject area courses, teacher education pedagogy, and real teaching experiences that enable candidates to gain secondary certification and complete (or nearly complete) requirements for an Master of Arts in Teaching in their teaching major. The program takes advantage of the close ties between the Jefferson County Public Schools through the Gheens Professional Development Academy and the surrounding counties of Oldham, Bullitt, Hardin, and Shelby. The unique curricula for the professional education courses of the Experimental Program are centered around the following themes: personal, integrated, excellence, idea-centered, teaming, and field-based.

The program begins in the summer with coursework and student teaching. During the academic year (August-May) students are assigned to teach 1/2 time on a special Rank IV certificate approved by the state, taking full responsibility for classes in conjunction with their interdisciplinary team or cooperating school coordinator. Also during the Fall and Spring students enroll in a special seminar and subject area courses to fulfill teaching major and MAT requirements. In the second summer, students complete a capstone seminar and enroll in courses to complete (or nearly complete) MAT requirements. Special emphasis is placed on minority recruitment. The School of Education's Minority Teacher Recruitment Program works closely with the Experimental Program to develop links to insure increasing

enrollment of minorities in the program. Eight minority candidates were part of the original pool of 52.

School districts participating in the program benefit in the following ways. They:

1. are able to hire a specially certified teacher half-time at the Kentucky Rank IV level.
2. are involved in the screening, interviewing and selection of the person.
3. select from a pool of applicants who have had extensive work experience and already hold their Bachelor's degree in a teaching major area.
4. are involved in the collaborative re-thinking of the preparation of teachers.
5. are able to recruit to areas of potential shortage.
6. are be able to recruit half time positions that could not be justified on full time basis (e.g., Foreign Languages such as German or Japanese; sciences such as physics or chemistry).
7. are personnel who can facilitate new school initiatives such as teaming or site-based management.
8. add faculty at low cost enabling schools to reduce teacher/pupil ratios.
9. re-invent their summer school to more successfully develop a remedial and enrichment environment and professional development center for teachers.

The Opportunities and Limitations of the Summer

Clinical experiences for prospective teachers almost always occur in schools during the regular school year. The first priority of the schools, appropriately, is educating their students. This context is replete with the benefits and limitations of the reality of the classroom (Jackson, 1968). These realities include dedicated (and not so dedicated) teachers

working extremely (or not so very) hard under reasonable (or impossible) conditions, with little or no time to plan or think, and attempting to educate students within a structure of policy and practice which is widely regarded as needing fundamental change to be effective (Sarason, 1982). In this context, the prospective teacher often represents a low priority and added burden to a teacher willing (or drafted) to assume an extra burden.

Summer can be outside the boundaries of the policies, practices, and habits which tend to constrain the regular school year. Players, curriculum, organization, and priorities are less bounded and more flexible. Thus, summer represents a prime time for teacher education to be a top priority in the organization and administration of the school.

Within MESTEP and the Experimental Program, the summer setting has the following advantages:

1. Prior to beginning summer student teaching, participants can complete intensive coursework within a designed schedule that is not possible during the regular semester schedule because of faculty time and facility space restrictions. This pre-student teaching time is important in cohort building and in creating the appropriate tension between preparing to teach in schools as they are and dreaming about schools as they might be.

2. Staff, especially the Mentor teachers, work with the programs because they choose to and because they choose to work in a teacher education environment.

3) In MESTEP, student teaching is assessed in teams of 4 or 5 candidates, thus creating a base of common experience and mutual support unavailable in solo settings. In the Experimental Program ongoing supervision and guidance possible in the summer allows students the chance to reflect and change practice very quickly.

4) Flexibility and autonomy are greater for students, teachers, and student teachers in this relatively unbureaucratic setting.

5) Adult-to-adult access, within and between university, school, and student teaching personnel is far easier than in the larger, more densely scheduled school year. In addition, interruptions are far fewer during the class periods, allowing more focussed teaching.

6) University faculty have the chance to spend time in schools and supervise and conduct seminars on-site.

7) The new group of participants can work with the "graduating" cohort since their summer sessions overlap.

The opportunities of the summer setting create an environment described by one MESTEP graduate as, "teaching with a safety net." Morning teaching followed by afternoon planning allows real time for processing and looking ahead. Students typically have 1-2 preparations. Evenings can be made relatively free for relaxation with the hard preparation in the afternoon.

However, the summer is still primarily a remedial setting (Oakes, 1985; Powell, Farrar & Cohen, 1985). Most students are

there because they failed a class during the year and now are expected to repeat that class, covering a year's expectations in 1/4 the time. Teachers feel obligated to "cram" content designed for a full year into 6-8 weeks. In addition, summer school offerings are not as comprehensive as the regular year. Physics candidates typically work in an enrichment introductory course with a handful of students and teach a physical science course for freshmen. Consequently, some of the programs' students have smaller classes and different assignments then they are likely to have after the summer school.

Each year at least one program student has struggled in the intensive summer setting. The speed at which students enter the program, begin teaching, and challenge old notions about education can create an urgency about the reality of teaching that takes longer to develop or does not develop at all in the regular 1-2 year course/student teaching scenarios of the regular programs. In cases where students identify themselves as reevaluating their decision to teach or where participating faculty and teachers raise the issue, individual conferencing is required to sort out the best course for the student. In 2 cases out of 125, MESTEP has advised a student not to continue in the program because it was apparent that continuing was not in anyone's best interests. In about 1 case each year, a student decides or is advised to complete more traditional student teaching during the fall semester as a way to continue their development under the guidance of a cooperating teacher. These

examples signal the individual nature of teacher preparation and the importance of good communication to identify concerns, work with students on improvement, not allow early identified issues to be self-fulfilling prophecies, and take alternative action if it is in the best interest of the students.

Administrative tasks must also be carried out in the summer setting. All student services from registration, housing, insurance, room scheduling, parking, library hours, etc...must be adapted to meet the unconventional nature of the alternative schedules.

Because of these limitations, the argument can be made that summer school is too intensive, too content oriented, and too unrealistic to serve as a successful student teaching environment. The experience of both programs, however, suggests that the benefits outweigh the limitations. The summer is a flexible environment where the focus is on teaching and learning, and where the schedule allows significant daily time for planning, coaching, and assessment. Berliner's research on academic learning indicates that learning is related not only to allocated time but to engaged time (Berliner, 1983; Berliner & Takunoff, 1976). The immersed summer setting is both realistic enough to give real clinical practice and unreal enough to challenge students that there are layers of development still ahead.

Summer Roles That University Faculty, Teachers, Administrators Play

Because the time constraints of the academic year are removed, university faculty, school administrators, and teachers can play overlapping roles that help break-down the traditional barriers between schools and universities. Faculty can team with teachers in early courses to provide a diverse content that centers around practice and challenges status-quo assumptions. Teachers can serve as mentors, with appropriately blurry roles as instructors, supervisors, colleagues, and big brother/sister. Teachers in these roles can then challenge their own notions about curriculum, instruction, new ideas, etc... Faculty working closely with teachers are forced to reconsider their preservice course content because they immediately see its usefulness (or lack of usefulness) in school settings and because they can continue the dialogue at a school site using day-to-day experience to make real the theory (Dewey, 1965). This exciting blending of talents requires a willingness to work together and a planning mechanism in the spring semester prior to the summer that is not part of the norm in teacher education. Both programs face an ongoing dilemma in finding enough time to think and plan thoughtfully the opportunities of the summer school setting.

Importance of the Cohort

One real advantage of the intensity of the summer school is the sharing of the collective experience of the participants. The cohort of students that make up each program are the

programs' strengths. The diversity of the backgrounds, experiences, and interests of the neat people who take part is a terrific recruitment vehicle as well as the glue that can build a collegial body of new teachers who are excited about working together as professionals. High expectations of performance are established and peer support becomes a major center of learning.

The cohort can easily backfire as any negative experiences are magnified and replayed through the group. Close contact with the students can help determine whether an issue is big enough to take time to work through or if larger problems need to be dealt with. Our early program experiences showed that administrative details like registration, application materials, forms, housing, etc...take precedence over the content of the program and must be dealt promptly outside of the teaching and coursework in order to "free" students to focus on teaching. Programs that use the summer intensively must have the resources available to deal with the details that special offices typically handle alone during the year.

Joint Planning

Administrative support both at the university and school level is crucial to program success in the summer. Budget allocations for summer school are different in these types of arrangements because they involve alternative schedules and overlapping planning, instruction, and administrative responsibilities. Partial funding for teachers serving as instructors in summer high school student courses should

complement additional stipends for roles as Mentors. University faculty need compensation for planning time as well as teaching/advising time. Program administration and organization need ongoing attention.

Beyond the details of budget and planning is a vision of the leadership at the cooperating school and university. Programs like these are "inefficient" in that they require a new mix of resources and a great deal of ambiguity in order to effectively meet the multiple needs of all parties. Built into both programs is the chance to rethink how we currently go about teacher education and how we might work together to combine professional renewal and teacher education.

The process of originating programs like these is important. They require state department of education approval, internal consent from the School of Education, and dialogue and formal agreements with schools. The MESTEP partnership began as a result of conversations between a university faculty member and a school superintendent who had positive professional relationship for more than a decade, and who agreed that recruiting diverse, talented college graduates into teaching was critical to both schools and the university. Each of the two identified a broader group of colleagues in their respective institutions who shared the sense of importance of the recruitment goal. The broader group met and agreed that a third party, industry, was both a shareholder in the agenda and a key to both the problem and potential solutions.

A series of meetings were held with school and university representatives and sketches of possible approaches to the goal were developed and presented to corporate representatives assembled by the Massachusetts High Technology Council--who had agreed to the importance of the agenda and the potential role that the private sector might play. Following these discussions, Digital Equipment Corporation agreed to join the partnership and the MESTEP Planning Board was established to design and support the implementation and development of the project. Consisting of 5 university faculty members, 5 school superintendents, and 4 corporate managers, the Planning Board has served as a central component of MESTEP as the project has grown over six years to include 50 schools and 15 corporations.

When the University of Louisville received a grant to establish a Center for Excellence, one of the key projects in the proposal was to develop and implement a 9-12 Post-Baccalaureate Experimental Teacher Preparation Program. The Chair of the Department of Secondary Education was then responsible for facilitating the development of the idea. As an important first step, he formed a program Advisory Committee consisting of teachers from the local districts, a representative of the teacher's union, several school district personnel, secondary education faculty, and students, both undergraduate and graduate, who were either currently enrolled in the existing program or were graduates of it. The committee met twice a month for three months and candidly discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the

current program, what an ideal program would look like, and from these discussions generated a set of principles to guide the development of it.

Once this process was completed, a program prospectus was written and circulated among a variety of constituencies for reaction and suggestions, and a final version was then presented to the Council on Teacher Education and the State Board of Education for reaction and approval. The final document was the result of numerous iterations, lengthy discussions and negotiations. Essential to the success of the program was a commitment for half-time paid positions for the participants provided by the school districts. The timing was not the best for starting the program in a year when several of the local school districts discovered late in the school year that they would have surplus teachers who would either have to be relocated or laid off. Therefore, the first year of the program began in a modest way, with 8 of the anticipated 20 participants. Our first year's experience has made clear the need for earlier planning but anticipation of variable school staffing needs. As an example, considerable planning is underway to modify the summer school program to make it more representative of a cross-section of students in more typical classes.

Wrap-Up Second Summer

A second summer of classes is an opportunity to process real teaching situations, to continue to develop vision and skills of teaching, and to serve as a bridge between the program and full-

time teaching. It is a chance for the cohort to spend intensive time together revisiting the areas of summer one and to document the success and frustrations of the year in between (Lipsky, 1980; Lortie, 1975).

In MESTEP, the second summer is a full load of education requirements that complete the M.Ed. and certification programs. One course deals with using technology in teaching. Another investigates issues of diversity and alternative curriculum in the classroom. A third is a workshop on supervision that allows students to work with the new candidates who are now student teaching. And a fourth course allows students to process their experience together and for program development purposes through in-depth interviewing and profile development (Seidman, 1985).

The Experimental Program uses the first of three University of Louisville summer sessions to conduct a capstone seminar for students. It is a forum to process the experience of the previous year, to reflect on the realities of teaching, to build on strengths to continue the ongoing development of the new teacher, and to allow some exchange between the new groups entering the program and those just completing it. The seminar is also used to introduce the participants to the Kentucky First Year Internship Program, in particular the evaluation procedures and instruments to prepare them for their first year regular teaching position. At the conclusion of the capstone seminar, students have completed their professional education requirements and for the balance of the summer enroll in coursework to work

toward finishing their teaching major and/or their MAT. Some students, because they entered the program needing several courses to complete their major, continue to work toward the Master's in the subsequent year.

Implications for Teacher Educators

Working in collaborative relationships to plan, develop, and initiate programs like MESTEP and the Experimental Program allows teacher educators the opportunity to explore new and alternative ways to prepare teachers and to examine systematically the effectiveness of those new approaches. At the same time it brings to the surface the institutional impediments toward transforming teacher education (Jones & Maloy, 1988; Wittrock, 1986). Using the umbrella of creating the most positive introductory experience that can be envisioned for a new teacher requires joint planning between school and university people, flexible thinking and scheduling, and a review of preservice courses, summer high school offerings, and the roles teachers and faculty can play. In both MESTEP and the Experimental Program, program directors reformat existing courses, compress time requirements, provide financial support for students, and create the mechanism for working on a Master's degree. A major success of both programs is in the area of minority recruitment, with higher proportionate interest and participation than in the regular secondary programs. With the increasing popularity of fifth-year and special programs for new teachers it is likely that new ventures can anticipate certain impediments based on the

experiences described here (Holmes Group, 1986).

For universities that are or will be creating new programs, or who will be searching for alternative emergency certification options to fill critical subject area need and teacher shortages, the summer experience of these intensive Master's programs shows the opportunity of the summer to provide an exciting clinical setting. The greatest opportunity of these programs is to continue to ask the questions, "What should a new teacher know? When should they be exposed to it? How much should take place "doing it" and how much in the "ivory tower"? Do arts and sciences graduates with excellent academic backgrounds and diverse experiences make better teachers? How can we work more closely with school colleagues to link preservice teacher education with professional renewal?" Our mission in these programs, especially by use of the summer, is not to discover one "best" way to answer these questions, but to enlarge the possibilities in teacher education and to expand the opportunities to allow talented people at all ages and levels of outside experience the chance to consider teaching as part of their career.

REFERENCES

Berliner, D. (1983). Developing conceptions of classroom environments : some light on the t in classroom studies of ATI. Educational Psychologist, 18, 1-13.

Berliner, D. & Takunoff, W. (1976). The california beginning teacher evaluation study: Overview of the ethnographic study. Journal of Teacher Education. 27(1), 24-30.

Dewey, J. (1965). The relation of theory to practice in education. In M.L. Borrowman (Ed.), Teacher Education in America: a documentary history (pp.140-171). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University. (Original work published 1904)

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Jones, B. & Maloy, R. (1988) Partnerships for improving schools. New York: Greenwood Press.

Jackson, P. (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York: Basic Books.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Oakes,J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Powell, A., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Sarason, S. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Seidman, E. (1985). In the words of the faculty. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Wittrock, M (Ed.). (1986). Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.